

MINUTES  
BOARD MEETING  
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

March 2, 2017

Los Angeles

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Board President, Matthew McGuinness, called the meeting to order at 11:19 a.m. and Board Secretary, Tian Feng, called roll.

Board Members Present

Matthew McGuinness, President  
Sylvia Kwan, Vice President  
Tian Feng, Secretary  
Jon Alan Baker  
Denise Campos  
Pasqual Gutierrez  
Ebony Lewis  
Robert C. Pearman, Jr.  
Nilza Serrano  
Barry Williams

Guests Present

Andrew Bowden, Member, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)  
Mark Christian, Director of Legislative Affairs, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)  
Ida Clair, Principal Architect, Division of the State Architect, State of California Department of General Services  
Michael Hricak, Lecturer, University of Southern California (USC) School of Architecture  
Charles Lagreco, Associate Professor, USC School of Architecture  
Doug Stead, Executive Director, California Council for Interior Design Certification (CCIDC)  
Roze Wiebe, Administrative Director, CCIDC

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer (EO)  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer (AEO)  
Alicia Hegje, Program Manager Administration/Enforcement  
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst  
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing  
Bob Carter, Architect Consultant  
Rebecca Bon, Staff Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being 10 present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

B. PRESIDENT'S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Mr. McGuinness 1) announced that LATC member, Andrew Bowden, is in attendance, 2) thanked Michael Hricak and Charles Lagreco for organizing a tour of the USC School of Architecture, and 3) reminded members that votes on all motions are to be taken by roll-call.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Bowden, the immediate Past Chair of LATC, reiterated that he is present to represent the LATC.

D. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON DECEMBER 15-16, 2016 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. McGuinness asked for comments concerning the minutes of the December 15-16, 2016, Board meeting and Strategic Planning Session.

- **Tian Feng moved to approve the December 15-16, 2016, Board meeting minutes.**

**Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.**

Nilza Serrano noted that she was absent for the December 15, 2016, Board meeting, but present for the December 16, 2016, Strategic Planning session. There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Doug McCauley reminded the Board that it is currently part of Release 3 of the enforcement case management and licensing system known as BreZE. Mr. McCauley reported that the DCA intends for phase three boards to be rolled out in subgroups. He explained that the Board is likely assigned to the second or third subgroup. Mr. McCauley reported that DCA's BreZE cost-benefit analysis is not yet complete.

Mr. McCauley also reminded the Board that it developed new Strategic Plan objectives at the last meeting. He mentioned that sometime shortly after the March Board meeting, members will be surveyed by staff regarding their availability for upcoming committee meetings. Mr. McCauley informed that he currently serves on the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Model Law Task Force; he shared that he is advocating for diverse and alternate pathways to licensure as well as a written contract requirement.

Sylvia Kwan reported that Oregon, surprisingly, is among the states that oppose diverse pathways to licensure. Ms. Kwan noted that Jon Alan Baker and Mr. McCauley recently defended the need for diverse pathways, and that a national accredited-degree-only approach to licensure does not work for a state like California. Denise Campos enquired who from the Board will attend the upcoming NCARB Regional Summit to present California's perspectives and positions on matters

of importance. Mr. McCauley replied that this year's NCARB delegation will be composed of himself, President McGuinness, Vice President Kwan, Secretary Feng, and Mr. Baker.

Mr. McCauley also reported on the Board's recent enforcement and examination metrics, noting that the number of pending caseloads have decreased dramatically in recent years.

Marccus Reinhardt shared that the Board processes licensing applications within 7 to 10 days of receipt. Mr. Baker opined it would be helpful for the Board to know how many enforcement complaints fall into exempt areas of practice versus areas regulated by the Architects Practice Act (Act). He suggested the information may help give the Board a greater sense of where and what it should be focusing on in the realm of communications and strategy. Bob Carter estimated that 90 percent of complaints come from first-time residential consumers of architectural services.

Mr. Feng observed that the second largest enforcement-related violations are related to continuing education (CE) requirements. He expressed a desire to discuss the Board's CE requirements within the context of its Strategic Plan. Mr. McGuinness noted that CE violations in fiscal year 2015/16 make up 52 percent of all violations; he enquired about why CE violations appear higher during that year compared to other years. Mr. McCauley explained that CE is a relatively new requirement, and that many CE audits become citations in part because licensees do not fully understand the requirement. Ms. Kwan asked if the Board has any power to change CE requirements in a way that covers subjects other than accessibility - a subject which, in practice, does not change. Mr. McCauley replied that, yes, the Board does have that power and may discuss CE requirements generally, and potential CE changes specifically, in greater detail when properly agendaized. He explained that, per an objective in the Strategic Plan, the Board will be preparing a report to the Legislature, which can address the potential for CE changes. Mr. Williams asked if the Board had collected data on the number of enforcement cases related to accessibility prior to the legislation being approved and after the law was passed. Mr. McCauley informed that the Board's Legislative Report due to the Legislature in January 2019 will include data on enforcement actions related to accessibility and issues concerning CE requirements that may be explored and addressed in the report. Mr. Feng requested that the issue of CE be included as an agendaized topic of discussion for the next Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) meeting.

Pasqual Gutierrez observed that California's pass-rates in three divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) 4.0 have struggled to rise above 50 percent compared to the national average. Mr. Gutierrez enquired when ARE 5.0 test results will be available, to which Mr. Reinhardt replied that NCARB will release the results over the next several months. Mr. Gutierrez stated that ARE 4.0 is a content-based examination, while ARE 5.0 is a knowledge-based examination, and there may be performance differences between the two examinations.

## **F. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION**

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that Assembly Bill (AB) 1489 (Brough) is AIACC-sponsored legislation that proposes the following two changes to the Architects Practice Act via Business and Professions Code section (BPC) 5536.25:

1. Clarification that an architect is not responsible for damage caused by "construction deviating from a permitted set of plans, specifications, reports, or documents" not authorized or approved in writing by the architect; and
2. An update to the definition of "construction observation services" to clarify that those services do not include inspection, or determining or defining means and methods (the day-to-day activities a contractor employs to complete construction).

Mark Christian added that “inspection” is not “construction observation.” Mr. Baker commented that, in his view, the proposed changes are sensible. He asked if there are any organizations opposed to this legislation, to which Mr. Christian indicated that he knows of none. Mr. McGuinness asked why AIACC believes there is a need for clarifying language. Mr. Christian explained the difference between “changes” to plans and “deviations” from plans; he provided an example of how an architect would not be liable for damages if caused by an unauthorized change or deviation. Robert Pearman enquired about the meaning of “inspection” as it relates to construction observation services, to which Mr. Hricak explained that, according to American Institute of Architects (AIA) contract, an architect may only “inspect” on two occasions. Mr. Christian clarified that, like “determining” or “defining means or methods,” “inspection” does not mean “construction observation services.” Mr. Carter noted that “inspection” is a higher degree of “observation.” Mr. Feng shared that, in many aspects of practice, particularly for large infrastructures (e.g., bridges, tunnels), contract specifies quite clearly the scope of architectural work; practitioners may not always use AIA-specific documentation. He expressed doubt about how effective the Board can be using regulatory means to define words in an attempt to resolve contract issues. Mr. Feng conveyed concern that creating more language, exclusions, terms, and definitions may invite enforcement complications. He opined that AB 1489 does not actually protect the public interest. Ms. Serrano enquired about the proposed legislation’s consumer protection elements, to which Mr. Gutierrez opined the proposed legislation is no threat to consumer protection.

- **Jon Alan Baker moved to support AB 1489 (Brough).**

**Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Member Feng opposed the motion. The motion passed 9-1-0.**

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that Senate Bill (SB) 247 (Moorlach) states the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would reduce occupational licensing requirements. He noted that the Bill is currently a “spot bill” and has no substantive content.

Mr. McCauley also informed the Board of a third legislative item on the meeting agenda; CCIDC’s proposed amendments to BPC 5800. He advised that one of the key issues for the interior design profession over the years has been the challenge of submitting construction documents to local building departments. He explained that the CCIDC proposal to address the problem of local acceptance of plans is to modify the current definition of “certified interior designer.” Mr. McCauley advised that the question of whether health, safety, and welfare concerns exist with the proposed additions to the definition should be considered. He also reminded the Board that CCIDC is not a state licensing board, but, instead, is an independent non-profit corporation recognized in state law with provisions codified into the same BPC as the Board’s provisions.

Doug Stead addressed the Board and noted that CCIDC should be considered a strategic partner. Mr. Stead explained the history of interior designer certification, which, he noted, came about via “exempt areas of practice.” Mr. Stead advised that those exemptions for many people, including building officials, are not very clear and varies across the state as to what an interior designer can or

cannot do under those exemptions. He informed that CCIDC certifies over 2,000 individuals in California; 124 of them are architects. Mr. Stead further informed that CCIDC is one of five certification boards currently operating under the State of California. He stated that CCIDC is subject to Sunset Review in the same way that the Board is subject. Mr. Stead explained that CCIDC's proposal should be accepted as an occupational standard, a clarification of what interior designers are allowed to do under the BPC 5537 and 5538 exemptions (nonstructural and nonseismic). He stated that some interior designers across the state have no problem doing horizontal exiting, reflected ceiling plans, and the kind of nonstructural, nonseismic interior design work in both commercial and residential settings. Mr. Stead explained that the final decision of whether their work is permitted rests with the building official; the problem exists when an interior designer's work gets turned down under the belief that the work is not exempt under the Act. Mr. Stead stated that, in the past, CCIDC raised the question to the Board of whether doing horizontal exiting and reflected ceiling plans are violations of law or are against the building code. The answer, he recalled, is no. Mr. Stead stated that the proposed definitions or occupational standards for interior designers are CCIDC's solution to this problem. He indicated that CCIDC has been asked by the Legislature to see whether the Board will support this effort or, perhaps, remain neutral.

Mr. McCauley shared with the Board his concerns about this issue from a consumer protection perspective. If interior designers are tested for content and demonstrate competence for specific skills, he explained, the Board would be in a difficult position to say interior designers should not be providing specific services. Mr. McCauley also shared his understanding that building officials and CALBO have concerns with CCIDC's definition and are going to oppose the definition.

Mr. Carter spoke about the reality of standard details at the building department. He stated that the controversy exists in the last statement in the exemption, which reads "it shall not affect the safety of the building." Mr. Carter stated that it is therefore up to each individual building department to determine what affects the safety. He opined that issues such as design of rated corridors, horizontal exits, or any fire-rated items are not something that an architect creates on his or her own. In the end, Mr. Carter stated, if a building official says a Certified Interior Designer (CID) may address an exit item, the Board will accept the CID's construction documents for that situation; it is within their purview, even with changes, to accept or deny.

The Board discussed interior design certification and the distinction between a CID and interior decorator, circumstances that lead to permit avoidance, and CCIDC examination. Mr. McCauley explained that there is an element of the interior design profession that wants to be regulated by a board and have a state license, but the Administration generally does not support new licensing requirements.

Mr. Baker commented that a CID's signature and stamp on plans must represent that the CID knows, for instance, what type of anchorage is necessary to hold up soffit, or how to do proper seismic restraints on a ceiling that was just erected. He argued that a CID's signature, license, and certification must mean something, and must not pass responsibility onto the building official who is there to identify problems. Mr. Stead stated that CID's boundary of work is limited by the BPC, and that interior designers are allowed to design space, exiting, and mechanical planning in historic buildings according to B-occupancy. Mr. Baker stated that he is looking to understand where the definition is because at a certain point, CIDs are practicing architecture (i.e., space planning of an entire building, all the vertical exiting, all the horizontal exiting, the fire sprinkler system, the mechanical the electrical system). Mr. Stead stated that the exemptions are the Board's own, were created in 1939, and have been tweaked at various places over time. He said they are vague and

that is the problem. Mr. Stead stated that CCIDC is seeking clarification, as well as the ability for building officials to understand where those limits are.

Mr. Feng asked for clarity about B-occupancy, to which Mr. Stead explained that BPC 5537 contains the provisions for exempt areas of practice. Mr. Stead asked the Board to consider identifying which activities are specifically allowed and not allowed under its own exemptions. He noted that the exemptions have not changed much and read as they did in 1939. Mr. Baker asked about the organizational structure of CCIDC, to which Mr. McCauley explained that CCIDC is a non-profit organization, but is recognized by California's BPC. He further explained that CCIDC is subject to a Written Contract provision, Rules of Professional Conduct and Sunset Review, and the Legislature has influence on CCIDC's compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act. Mr. Stead added that CCIDC's board is composed of members from different professional associations.

Mr. Baker enquired about CCIDC's process for disciplinary action. Mr. Stead explained that when CCIDC receives complaints that fall under the Act, they are referred to the Board. He stated that CCIDC has no jurisdiction over non-CIDs; therefore, CCIDC will simply counsel the consumer in those instances. However, although CCIDC does not have cite and fine authority, according to Mr. Stead, it can revoke one's CID certification and publish that action on the CCIDC website.

Mr. Christian stated that AIACC supports the extension of CCIDC's sunset date, but opposes certain expanded authorizations proposed by CCIDC. He shared AIACC's opinion that rated corridors and horizontal exiting should not be allowed for non-architects because these items affect the safety of the building and, therefore, would be in conflict with BPC 5538 of the Act.

Mr. Gutierrez asked which municipalities, as observed by CCIDC, reject CID submissions most often, to which Mr. Stead replied that Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Jose are the three primary municipalities. Mr. Gutierrez asked if CCIDC has entered into a dialogue with CALBO specifically about the rejection of CID plans, to which Mr. Stead replied that CCIDC and CALBO have dialoged about these issues for 20 years. Mr. Stead shared that, unless CCIDC can see the CID drawings, it cannot render a judgement; therefore, CCIDC tries to educate the designer who submitted the plans about BCP 5537 and 5538, and what they are allowed to do under the exemptions. He stated that the CID will then review his/her plans according to the new information, and if their drawings fit within those exemptions, they are encouraged by CCIDC to speak with the Building Official. Mr. Gutierrez asked if Mr. Stead sees any risk in its attempt to modify the BPC, to which Mr. Stead replied that CCIDC is seeking only to modify statute concerning interior design professionals; Mr. Stead noted that CCIDC has been asked by the Legislature to do so. Mr. Stead reminded the Board of a 1977 letter on the subject of BPC 5537 and 5538 authored by DCA legal counsel at the Board's request. He shared that the letter states clearly that an unlicensed person may prepare plans that do not change or affect the structure or safety of the building, but that each situation must be judged within its specific context. Mr. Stead stated that CCIDC is asking for CID drawings to be judged within this specific context at the Building Department, and not be rejected simply because the CID happens not to be an architect. Mr. Baker suggested the PQC could look closely at the way the area of exemption is currently written, and could make recommendations for changes. He also suggested CCIDC should be involved in those discussions to identify changes that are sensible, defensible, definable, consistent, and does not in any way risk consumer safety.

Mr. McCauley recommended that the Board follow AIACC's support for the extension of CCIDC's sunset date. He also advised that, indeed, committees may consider questions concerning exemptions and definitions around areas of practice if that is the will of the Board.

- **Jon Alan Baker moved to support the extension of CCIDC's sunset date, to, for the time being, oppose any changes in BPC at this time, and to assign the issue to the PQC for review of potential changes to BPC exemptions.**

**Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.**

Roze Wiebe commented that CCIDC is advocating for clarification of exempt language in BPC, whereas others are advocating for registration and licensure. Ms. Wiebe stated that clarity is needed so that CIDs in key California regions (e.g., Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose) may submit plans to Building Departments, and not be denied because they are not architects. Mr. Baker opined that changing language at this time would not solve the problem, but would, instead, potentially create additional problems.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

#### G. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON DRAFT 2017-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. McCauley presented the draft 2017-2018 Strategic Plan that the Board developed during its Strategic Planning Session in December 2016. He informed that the Strategic Plan reflects the objectives that were identified by the Board. Mr. McCauley noted a need for clarity for Goal Objective 1.1 under Professional Qualifications, and, with the assistance of Mr. Reinhardt, proposed that Goal 1.1 be modified to read: "Conduct an analysis to determine the effectiveness of the continuing education requirement (and identify alternatives as appropriate) and prepare a report for the Legislature."

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the 2017-2018 Strategic Plan with clarifying modifications to Goal Objective 1.1.**

**Tian Feng seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

#### H. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

Mr. McCauley announced that NCARB will have its Regional Summit on March 10-11, 2017. He also outlined the details of Resolution 2017-A, the resolution that will be acted upon at the NCARB Annual Business Meeting on June 21-24, 2017. Mr. McCauley explained that the resolution provides clarifying details about membership requirements for those who do not pay their dues in a timely manner. Mr. Baker further explained that the resolution would suspend member voting rights and limit member involvement if dues are not paid within six months. He noted that the resolution also gives members up to two years to bring their dues current before they are considered for removal from the organization with a two-thirds vote.

- **Jon Alan Baker moved to support NCARB Resolution 2017-A (NCARB Bylaws Amendment – Membership Requirements).**

**Barry Williams seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

The Board discussed the 2017 election of NCARB officers and directors. Ms. Serrano conveyed her desire for greater diversity and inclusion among the candidates who run for NCARB executive leadership positions. The Board agreed to first allow the NCARB delegation to hear speeches from candidates and report back to the Board before taking positions on those candidacies.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to table the selection of NCARB officer and director candidates to support until the next Board meeting.**

**Tian Feng seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

The Board discussed the 2017 election of Region VI Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards (WCARB) Executive Committee officers. Mr. McCauley announced that Ms. Kwan is running for a position on the WCARB Executive Committee.

- **Tian Feng moved to support Jim Oswald for Regional Director, Region 6; Edward T. Marley for Vice Chair of Region 6 Executive Committee; and Sylvia Kwan for Member of Region 6 Executive Director.**

**Denise Campos seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

#### **I. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ARCHITECT CONSULTANT CONTRACT FOR FEBRUARY 1, 2017 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2020**

Alicia Hegje reminded the Board that it employs two architect consultants, with one architect consultant contract having expired on January 31, 2017, and the other contract due to expire on June 30, 2019. Ms. Hegje explained the Request for Proposal (RFP) evaluation process and reported that the RFP Evaluation Committee selected Robert Lee Chase as the awardee of a new contract for architect consultant services for three years [February 1, 2017 (or upon approval), through January 31, 2020]. Ms. Serrano enquired about the process used to advertise this RFP

for architect consultant services, to which Ms. Hegje informed that the RFP was 1) advertised on the Internet under the Cal eProcure portal; 2) posted on the Board's website; 3) tweeted; 4) distributed to the Board's e-subscribers; and 5) shared with AIACC, Central Valley Chapter, the Asian American Architects and Engineers Association, the National Organization of Minority Architects, and the Board's subject matter experts.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the architect consultant contract with Robert Lee Chase for architect consultant services through January 31, 2020.**

**Robert C. Pearman, Jr. seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.**

J. UPDATE ON LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE JANUARY 17-18, 2017 MEETING

Mr. McCauley updated the Board on the recent activities of the LATC. He informed that the Committee met in January 2017 to discuss two main issues. The first was the issue of reciprocity for licensure, which, he explained, the Committee took action to expand current standards and create a pathway for reciprocity for experience-only candidates. The second issue, Mr. McCauley explained, concerned initial licensure requirements, where the LATC considered the question of whether university degrees related to the profession of landscape architecture (e.g., Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences, and Civil Engineering) should be accepted. He reported that the LATC will hold a special public forum on the related-degree issue on March 17, 2017, in Sacramento, and will next meet on April 5, 2017. Mr. Bowden explained that the LATC is attempting to mirror the Board's requirements on reciprocity. He also informed that the LATC is seeking guidance from stakeholders about which related degrees should be accepted in order to expand the pathway for entry into the profession.

K. REVIEW OF FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES

Mr. McCauley reported the following Board meeting dates and locations for the remainder of 2017:

- June 15<sup>th</sup> in San Francisco;
- September 7<sup>th</sup> in Burbank; and
- December 7<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento.

E.\* EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT - *Continued*

Board members and staff provided liaison reports on their assigned organizations and schools as follows:

Feng

University of California (UC), Berkeley  
Chabot College, Hayward  
Diablo Valley College, Pleasant Hill

Lewis

USC

Citrus College

East Los Angeles College

Los Angeles Valley College

Campos

UC, Los Angeles

Glendale Community College

Rio Hondo College, Whittier

Gutierrez

Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Woodbury University

Bakersfield College

Mt. San Antonio College, Walnut

San Bernardino Valley College

Serrano

Cerritos College, Norwalk

Los Angeles City College

Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa

Ventura College

Williams

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Southern California Institute of Architecture

College of the Desert, Palm Desert

College of the Sequoias, Visalia

Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo

Fresno City College

Mr. McGuinness opined the Board is struggling to present value to its stakeholders through the liaison program. He suggested that the Board consider changing the liaison program to make it more effective. Mr. McCauley agreed to consider changes and suggested contacting universities and organizations on an annual basis to share information about the Board.

H.\* NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) -  
Continued

Messrs. Hricak and Lagreco provided the Board with a presentation regarding the USC School of Architecture Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program. The presentation covered: 1) how students register to participate in the IPAL program, 2) the process to take the ARE while enrolled in the program prior to graduation, 3) the benefit of the reduced time required to obtain licensure via IPAL, and 4) the supporting roles of the USC Architectural Guild as well as USC's Not Licensed Yet (NotLY) community to the IPAL program.

Mr. Baker enquired about USC's timeline and approach to allow its IPAL-participating students to begin taking the ARE. Mr. Hricak described how USC freshmen are encouraged to make

thoughtful decisions about when they are prepared to begin testing for ARE divisions. Mr. Baker expressed agreement with the view that one of the most significant threats to obtaining licensure for a would-be architect is the delay of one's decision to begin the ARE. Mr. Lagreco stated that USC's intention is not to encourage its students to rush through the examination process, but, instead, to counsel them in terms of what is available. He explained that when a student conveys a desire to begin taking the ARE, the student is counseled, referred to NotLY, and monitored so that the process is properly implemented. Mr. Baker enquired about whether NCARB is fully aware of USC's approach to IPAL implementation. Mr. Hricak commented that USC's approach to its IPAL program is less choreographed than when NCARB initially received its proposal. Mr. Lagreco acknowledged that USC is in the early stages of implementing its IPAL program, and informed the Board that IPAL-student workshop sessions are being organized.

E.\* EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT - Continued

Board members and staff continued liaison reports on their assigned organizations and schools as follows:

Baker

AIACC

NewSchool of Architecture

San Diego Mesa College

Southwestern College, Chula Vista

Kwan

National Council of Examiners on Engineering and Surveying

Urban Land Institute

Academy of Art University

California College of the Arts

College of Marin, Kentfield

Cosumnes River College, Sacramento

McGuinness

College of San Mateo

City College of San Francisco

West Valley College, Saratoga

Associated General Contractors of California

McCauley

American Council of Engineering Companies

Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists

CALBO

Contractors State License Board

Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards

L\* CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session to:

1. Consider action on the December 15, 2016, Closed Session Minutes; and

2. Deliberate on disciplinary matters.

M\* RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened open session.

N\* ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

*\*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the schedule of guest speakers.  
The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*